

SCCC Minutes June 15, 2021
Zoom meeting hosted by David Chase, President, SCCC

Board members present: David Chase, Molly Child, Vicki, Judy Frey, Chris Collins, George Johnson, Jill Sabella

Guests: Mitch Haas, Julie and Jeff Echt, Kenneth Adler, Kathy deWolfe, John McBride, Alice Collins, Chelsea Brundige, Martha Ferguson, Ned Andrews, Michael Kinsley

Consideration of 1630 Gateway Development

As the meeting was delayed getting started due to location logistics, the meeting commenced with the Echt proposal to build at the 1630 Gateway Drive site. This site had been previously reviewed in July 21, 2020 with the Schoeberlein Application with a house that was proposed at 3,200 sf.

Mitch Haas, planner, and Kenneth Adler, architect, presented the Echt's plans for consideration as they want the Caucus's opinions and feedback before making an Application to the County. This is to be a permanent home which comes with an approved set of plans from the County. It would have four new view plans. Redesigning the four views was the launching place, and there was consultation with neighbors Vicki Treece and Rick Heede. It would use the same driveway as the previous application, which was approved by the County, though fill would be added. A "ridgeline review" is being done and more accurate story poles will be installed. It has long slung roofs and will be at the edge of the building envelope though they haven't met yet with a landscape architect.

Adler said they have concerns about the height limits and will meet with a civil engineer. The Echt house will be just under 4,900 sf. It will be "L" shaped, the garage and entrance about the same as the previous application. Mitch said the septic, slope stability etc. still has to be approved.

David commented that what is being presented is basically what we approved previously though this has a slightly lower roofline. They are looking for preliminary approval. Molly moved to approve with further review needed, it being a little higher than preferred.

The concerns expressed by the Board were that reflected light would be obvious and seen from all over the valley. The need to minimize outdoor lighting, and to shield house lighting will help keep our dark skies, which is important. Even with preapproval, this is a difficult site and because it's such an old subdivision, there exists the need to lessen the impact and stop ridgeline development now. Also, with so many planned windows that indoor light becomes outdoor lighting and the light reflection on windows causes birds to fly into the windows. Also the incoming heat through the west windows. Also, the ferocious winds homes on that ridge have.

Adler said there would be triple glazing on the windows for heat, the windows being up to 10' high and that the County has strict lighting standards to be met. Mitch said the overhangs are designed to that there's minimal upward lighting. Also there is no outdoor lighting and all lighting is down-directional.

Mitch noted the lot was approved by Gateway and that there's not a lot of room for sighting lighting and that they will comply with the County.

David moved to give preliminary approval to the plan. Molly made a motion to approve and David seconded. Molly and Vicki approved. However, there was a lack of approval from other Caucus members, so the motion to approve died.

Comments by the Board were that the proposal was too intense for the site, being vulnerable with steep slopes, and that they need to scale back in size. The Board wants to see the story poles and the amount of glass planned with glazing, and further development of the plans since they can't change the exact building location.

Adler question whether they need to dial back to what was previously approved. Mitch said the site was approved about a year ago and also the site stability and that they will be studying the effects of the Board's concerned issues, but that it's settled that the site is approved.

David added the Echts have a right to move forward and asked for questions/concerns. He thanked them for their presentation and asked them to come back for reconsideration.

Master Plan

David asked "where do we go from here" in the TDR issue. Do we want a professional survey? Do we want to get something on record now with the County for potential builders regarding TRD's? Are there specific issues we want to address? Whatever the Board comes up with will take time to get approval from the County and P&Z. We can't just say "no receiver sites" because that will take time to process. "It's not clear sailing."

Comments by the Board were that the Caucus should come up with a plan and let people know. That we do need a survey and that it should be short and carefully thought through.

How do big houses effect valley life? what is the effect on our infrastructure, especially water and preservation of energy. That the character of our valley is the most important thing to preserve and that we don't want castles here. The valley's character is not wealth, but reverence for nature. That the wealth issue can vibrate a character changer and we want to retain our local character. That the Grotjahn and new Clark sites are character changers. That cattle, not big homes is our history here and that if we have to have TDR's here, we need to restrict them. That a survey will take time and we need to put out an email regarding this. That the Caucus knows the issues and the consequences best. That we are a rural community and that we need to take the long look as preservationists in restricting development as it would be all too easy to ruin a community like ours. That we need to guide the valley since newcomers may well have a difference in values - for instance having dark skies at night.

That when thinking of house size, most important is energy conservation and having an environmentally responsible development. That possibly net-zero should not be a trade-off for a large house, and in our concern for our infrastructure, we should be progressive.

That our valley has always been an "outlier" and we hope we can continue to maintain our rural character. And the importance of "process" in doing a survey, to have three questions, not 72. Whether to do the survey via email and regular mail. That it's important to explain what a TDR is. That since the Caucus split, the Buttercup ranch has been the only TDR.

David commented the issue of a TDR is now under serious consideration and its important to let potential buyers/builders know that there's no certainty you get a TDR. He suggested that we put a statement on the website that this is under consideration, and that we need to form a committee to put together a survey and proceed. David asked George to lead in the survey making. Also on the committee are Chris, Vicki, Chelsea, John, Kathy. David said we will get information to the County that this is now all under consideration.

David moved to adjourn the meeting.